UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,901	04/19/2007	Georg Busch 0	071308.1022(2004P04704WO 6294	
31625 BAKER BOTT	7590 10/07/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA		CAZAN, LIVIUS RADU		
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039		[	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/599,901	BUSCH, GEORG	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LIVIUS R. CAZAN	3729	

	21110011. 07.27.11	0120
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orige than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading they raise new issues that would require further contained by They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	ter form for appeal by materially re	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-10,13-17,19-24 and 26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented.  S	al and/or appellant fails to provide a ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/A. Dexter Tugbang/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 3729

Continuation of 13. Other: The proposed amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant argues (see page 9 of the Remarks) layer 42 is an actual layer formed on layer 34 and not a roughened layer of conductor 34. Applicant also cites part of the Examiner's argument from the Office Action mailed on 10/6/2008, in which, allegedly, the Examiner argues layer 42 can actually be nothing more than a roughened surface of conductor 34.

The Examiner most respectfully disagrees. Applicant appears to have omitted part of the Examiner's argument in the prior Action. The complete argument presented by the Examiner in the Action mailed on 10/6/2008 essentially states that layer 42 is disclosed as a separate layer, formed by electroless plating (which is what Applicant is arguing). However, Hirose also discloses, at line 67 in column 15 to line 5 of column 16 that a coarsened layer can also be formed by a chemical process. In particular, Hirose states "The surfaces of the through hole land 36a and the conductor layer 34 instead of the coarsened layer 42 of this Cu--Ni--P alloy can be coarsened by an etching liquid constructed by compounding a second copper complex and an organic acid and can be also coarsened by oxidizing-reducing processing." In other words, instead of layer 42 being a separately applied layer, as shown in the drawings, it could be merely a chemically-roughened surface of layer 34, just as 38 is a roughened surface of layer 34 in Fig. 1D. Therefore, Hirose does disclose not applying any further layers, as claimed in the claims, including claim 6. The rejection is maintained.

Regarding the IDS submitted along with the Remarks, it will be considered in the next Action on the merits.